

1 BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP
 2 DONN P. PICKETT (SBN 72257)
 3 GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (SBN 157468)
 4 HOLLY A. HOUSE (SBN 136045)
 5 ZACHARY J. ALINDER (SBN 209009)
 6 BREE HANN (SBN 215695)
 7 Three Embarcadero Center
 8 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
 9 Telephone: (415) 393-2000
 10 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286
 11 donn.pickett@bingham.com
 12 geoff.howard@bingham.com
 13 holly.house@bingham.com
 14 zachary.alinder@bingham.com
 15 bree.hann@bingham.com

16 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
 17 DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
 18 333 Main Street
 19 Armonk, NY 10504
 20 Telephone: (914) 749-8200
 21 dboies@bsflp.com
 22 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (SBN 144177)
 23 1999 Harrison St., Suite 900
 24 Oakland, CA 94612
 25 Telephone: (510) 874-1000
 26 sholtzman@bsflp.com

27 DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049)
 28 JENNIFER GLOSS (SBN 154227)
 29 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7
 30 Redwood City, CA 94070
 31 Telephone: 650.506.4846
 32 Facsimile: 650.506.7114
 33 dorian.daley@oracle.com
 34 jennifer.gloss@oracle.com

35 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 36 Oracle USA, Inc., *et al.*

37 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 38 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 39 OAKLAND DIVISION

40 ORACLE USA, INC., *et al.*,

41 Case No. 07-CV-01658 PJH (EDL)

42 Plaintiffs,
 43 v.

**ORACLE'S PROPOSED FINDINGS OF
 FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

44 SAP AG, *et al.*,

45 Date: September 30, 2010
 46 Time: 9:00 am
 47 Place: 3rd Floor, Courtroom 3
 48 Judge: Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton

49 Defendants.

1 Pursuant to the Court's Pretrial Instructions, Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle
 2 International Corporation, Oracle EMEA Limited, and Siebel Systems, Inc. (collectively,
 3 "Oracle") submit the following proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law for "claims to
 4 be tried by the court." Case Management and Pretrial Order, Dkt. No. 84, at p. 4.

5 Oracle has two claims seeking only equitable relief, which may be tried by the court.

6 First, a claim under Section 17200 of the California Business and Professions Code, seeking
 7 among other things, injunctive relief against Defendants SAP AG, SAP America, Inc., and
 8 TomorrowNow, Inc. (collectively, "Defendants"). Second, a claim for an accounting seeking
 9 that Defendants account for the money that they secured through their illegal conduct.¹

10 However, as a preliminary matter, Oracle notes that its legal claims will have been tried
 11 prior to its equitable claims. *See Ross v. Bernhard*, 396 U.S. 531, 90 S.Ct. 733, 24 L.Ed.2d 729
 12 (1970) ("where equitable and legal claims are joined in the same action, there is a right to jury
 13 trial on the legal claims which must not be infringed either by trying the legal issues as incidental
 14 to the equitable ones or by a court trial of a common issue existing between the claims). The
 15 jury's fact-finding on the legal claims will be binding on the Court. *See Los Angeles Police
 16 Protective League v. Gates*, 995 F.2d 1469, 1473 (9th Cir. 1993) ("in a case where legal claims
 17 are tried by a jury and equitable claims are tried by a judge, and the claims are "based on the
 18 same facts," in deciding the equitable claims "the Seventh Amendment requires the trial judge to
 19 follow the jury's implicit or explicit factual determinations."). Thus, as a practical matter, the
 20 jury will likely make findings on most of the facts relevant to Oracle's equitable claims.

21 **I. PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT**

22 **Unfair Competition Claim**

23 1. The jury having found Defendants liable for violation of the CFAA, CDAFA,
 24 intentional and negligent interference with prospective economic advantage, breach of contract,
 25 unjust enrichment and trespass to chattels, any one of which would be sufficient to establish a
 26

27 ¹ Any equitable defenses have not been addressed in this document, given the limited
 scope in the Pretrial Instructions to "cases or claims to be tried to the court."

1 claim for unlawful conduct under 17200, *see Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. L.A. Cellular Tel. Co.*,
 2 20 Cal. 4th 163, 180 (Cal. 1992); *see also Saunders v. Super. Ct.*, 27 Cal. App. 4th 832, 838-
 3 39 (Cal. Ct. App. 1994) (“The ‘unlawful’ practices prohibited by section 17200 are any practices
 4 forbidden by law, be it civil or criminal, federal, state, or municipal, statutory, regulatory, or
 5 court-made.”), the Court finds in favor of plaintiffs on their 17200 claim. Defendants have
 6 engaged in unlawful, fraudulent and unfair business practices by committing illegal acts,
 7 including computer fraud, trespass to chattels, breach of contract, unjust enrichment and
 8 interference with business relationships.

9 2. Defendants committed these acts to gain an unfair competitive advantage in the
 10 form of, for example, better publicity, better revenue stream, disruption of Oracle’s ability to
 11 compete, harm to Oracle’s share price and devaluation of Oracle’s recently acquired software
 12 brands.

13 3. Defendants recruited Oracle customers and acquired support fees from those
 14 customers based on their unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent business practices.

15 4. As a result of Defendants’ illegal conduct, Oracle has suffered irreparable injury
 16 and, unless Defendants are enjoined, will continue to suffer irreparable injury, whereby Oracle
 17 has no adequate remedy at law.

18 **Accounting**

19 5. The jury having found Defendants liable for violations of the CFAA, CDAFA,
 20 breach of contract, intentional and negligent interference with prospective economic advantage,
 21 unjust enrichment and trespass to chattels, the Court finds that, as a result of those violations,
 22 Defendants have received money properly due and owing to Oracle, and Defendants
 23 misappropriated Oracle’s property and used that property to create a financial benefit in which
 24 Oracle is entitled to share.

25 6. The total amount of money due from Defendants to Oracle is unknown to Oracle
 26 and cannot be fully ascertained without an accounting of the income and gross profits
 27 Defendants have obtained through their wrongful and unlawful conduct of obtaining and using
 28 Oracle’s property.

1 **Indirect Liability of SAP AG and SAP America on Equitable Claims**

2 7. The jury having found Defendants liable for violation of the CFAA, CDAFA,
 3 breach of contract, intentional and negligent interference with prospective economic advantage,
 4 unjust enrichment and trespass to chattels, and the Court having found those violations sufficient
 5 to constitute unfair business practices under Section 17200, the Court finds that SAP AG and
 6 SAP America manifested an intent that TomorrowNow should act on their behalf in performing
 7 the illegal, unfair and fraudulent business practices of TomorrowNow, as well as the wrongful
 8 conduct resulting in the need for an accounting.

9 8. TomorrowNow accepted that undertaking, and there was an understanding
 10 between the parties that SAP AG and SAP America had control of TomorrowNow's business
 11 practices and conduct.

12 9. TomorrowNow conducted its illegal, unfair and fraudulent business practices, as
 13 well as the wrongful conduct resulting in the need for an accounting, within the scope of its
 14 authority from SAP AG and SAP America and as their agent.

15 10. Further, SAP AG and SAP America were aware of TomorrowNow's illegal,
 16 unfair and fraudulent business practices, as well as the wrongful conduct resulting in the need for
 17 an accounting.

18 11. SAP AG and SAP America agreed to commit, and intended that TomorrowNow
 19 commit, the illegal, unfair and fraudulent business practices, as well as the wrongful conduct
 20 resulting in the need for an accounting.

21 12. SAP AG and SAP America knew that TomorrowNow was committing illegal,
 22 unfair and fraudulent business practices against Oracle and also knew of the wrongful conduct
 23 resulting in the need for an accounting, and they gave substantial assistance and encouragement
 24 to TomorrowNow.

25 13. Further, TomorrowNow intended to act on behalf of SAP AG and SAP America,
 26 SAP AG and SAP America learned of TomorrowNow's conduct, including after illegal conduct
 27 occurred, and SAP AG and SAP America approved of TomorrowNow's conduct.

28

1 **II. PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**2 **Unfair Competition**

3 1. The jury having found Defendants liable for violation of the CFAA, CDAFA
 4 intentional and negligent interference with prospective economic advantage, breach of contract,
 5 unjust enrichment and trespass to chattels, any one of which would be sufficient to establish a
 6 claim for unlawful conduct under 17200, *see Cel-Tech Commc'nns, Inc. v. L.A. Cellular Tel. Co.*,
 7 20 Cal. 4th 163, 180 (Cal. 1992); *see also Saunders v. Super. Ct.*, 27 Cal. App. 4th 832, 838-
 8 39 (Cal. Ct. App. 1994) (“The ‘unlawful’ practices prohibited by section 17200 are any practices
 9 forbidden by law, be it civil or criminal, federal, state, or municipal, statutory, regulatory, or
 10 court-made.”), the Court concludes that Oracle has established that Defendants violated
 11 numerous laws under the unlawful prong of Section 17200, including committing computer
 12 fraud, breach of contract, interference with business relationships, unjust enrichment and trespass
 13 to chattels.

14 2. Oracle has established that Defendants acted unfairly under the unfairness prong
 15 of Section 17200.

16 3. Oracle has established that Defendants acted fraudulently under the fraudulent
 17 prong of Section 17200.

18 4. Oracle has established the need for injunctive relief against Defendants.

19 5. Oracle has established that it is entitled to further relief under Section 17200,
 20 including an award of attorneys’ fees and costs.

22 **Accounting**

23 6. The jury having found Defendants liable for violation of the CFAA, CDAFA,
 24 breach of contract, intentional and negligent interference with prospective economic advantage,
 25 unjust enrichment and trespass to chattels, and through such violations having received money
 26 properly due and owing to Oracle, the Court concludes that Oracle has established that it is
 27 entitled to a full accounting of the money properly due and owing to Oracle from Defendants,
 28 including through the misuse of Oracle property to create a financial benefit in which Oracle is

1 entitled to share. *See Teselle v. McLoughlin*, 173 Cal. App. 4th 156, 179-80 (Cal. Ct. App. 2009)
 2 (relationship necessary to claim for accounting may be formed where defendant possesses money
 3 or property it is obliged to surrender to plaintiff); *see also* Mathew Bender California Forms of
 4 Pleading and Practice, §7.12[1].

5 **Indirect Liability of SAP AG and SAP America on Equitable Claims**

6 7. The jury having found Defendants liable for violation of the CFAA, CDAFA,
 7 breach of contract, intentional and negligent interference with prospective economic advantage,
 8 unjust enrichment and trespass to chattels, the violations of which the Court has concluded
 9 constitute unfair business practices and create the need for an accounting, the Court concludes
 10 that Oracle has established that SAP AG and SAP America are liable for the illegal, unfair and
 11 fraudulent business practices of TomorrowNow, as well as the wrongful conduct resulting in the
 12 need for an accounting, because TomorrowNow was acting as their agent within the scope of its
 13 authority.

14 8. Oracle has established that SAP AG and SAP America are liable as co-
 15 conspirators for the illegal, unfair and fraudulent business practices of TomorrowNow, as well as
 16 the wrongful conduct resulting in the need for an accounting.

17 9. Oracle has established that SAP AG and SAP America are liable for the illegal,
 18 unfair and fraudulent business practices of TomorrowNow, as well as the wrongful conduct
 19 resulting in the need for an accounting, because they aided and abetted TomorrowNow.

20 10. Oracle has established that SAP AG and SAP America are liable for the illegal,
 21 unfair and fraudulent business practices of TomorrowNow, as well as the wrongful conduct
 22 resulting in the need for an accounting, because they ratified TomorrowNow's conduct.

23 **Equitable Relief**

24 11. Oracle has established that it is entitled to entry of an order for a permanent
 25 injunction restraining Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and
 26 those in active concert or participation with any of them, from the following:

27 (a) Copying, distributing, using, or creating derivative works from
 28 Oracle software or support materials or software environments in any way, including for any

1 business purpose, except as otherwise allowed by express license from Oracle or as otherwise set
 2 forth below;

3 (b) Copying, distributing or storing, or facilitating copying,
 4 distribution or storage of, any Oracle software or support materials directly or indirectly from or
 5 to any of Defendants' offices, computer systems or networks;

6 (c) Using any bot, scraper, spider, or other software tool (including
 7 without limitation Titan and its predecessor scripts) to access, copy, distribute or use any Oracle
 8 software or support materials in any way, including for any business purpose;

9 (d) Facilitating the downloading of any Oracle software or support
 10 materials from any Oracle support website for, or on behalf of, any customer who does not have
 11 a valid, existing and currently-Oracle-supported software license for the specific materials being
 12 downloaded from Oracle entitling that customer to have and use that software or support
 13 materials;

14 (e) Facilitating the access to, use of, or downloading from any Oracle
 15 support website for, or on behalf of, any customer other than by using that specific customer's
 16 valid login credentials;

17 (f) Regardless of the location of any specific software or support
 18 materials or software environments, copying, distributing or using Oracle software, support
 19 materials, or any software environments obtained through or for one customer to support a
 20 different customer; or,

21 (g) Otherwise engaging in acts of unfair competition, copyright
 22 infringement, trespass, unjust enrichment, computer fraud, breach of contract or interference
 23 with Oracle's business relationships.

24 12. Oracle has established that it is entitled to entry of an order directing Defendants
 25 to return Oracle's property, including, without limitation, Oracle's confidential, proprietary, and
 26 copyrighted software and support materials, including data, internal documents, and valuable
 27 updates, patches, fixes, and other computer code, that Defendants took from Oracle.

28 13. Oracle has established that it is entitled to entry of an order impounding or

1 destroying any and all of Defendants' infringing materials, including Titan, pursuant to 17
2 U.S.C. § 503.

3 14. Oracle has established that it is entitled to entry of an order requiring Defendants
4 to restore and/or disgorge all ill-gotten gains unjustly obtained and retained by Defendants
5 through their illegal conduct.

6 15. Oracle has established that it is entitled to entry of an order for an accounting of
7 the money Defendants received that was properly due and owing to Oracle as a result of
8 Defendants' illegal conduct.

9

10 DATED: August 5, 2010

Bingham McCutchen LLP

11

By: _____ /s/ Zachary J. Alinder
12 Zachary J. Alinder
13 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
14 Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International
Corporation, Oracle EMEA Limited, and Siebel
Systems, Inc.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28